

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/604,293	DIXON	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Andrew W. Johns	2624	

All Participants:

- (1) Andrew W. Johns, examiner.
- (2) Patrick Yoder, applicant's representative.

Status of Application: amended

(3) _____

(4) _____

Date of Interview: 16 May 2007

Time: 9:40am

Type of Interview:

- ☒ Telephonic
- ☐ Video Conference
- ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant ☐ Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☒ No

If Yes, provide a brief description:

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Obviousness-type double patenting rejection

Claims discussed:

None

Prior art documents discussed:

None

Part II.


SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

See Continuation Sheet

Part III.

- ☒ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
- ☐ It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

ANDREW W. JOHNS
PRIMARY EXAMINER



(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Examiner acknowledged applicant's comments filed 23 April 2007 requesting that the provisional obviousness-type double patenting rejection be withdrawn, as the case should be otherwise in condition for allowance. However, Examiner pointed out that the co-pending application had already been allowed when the provisional rejection was made and has in fact subsequently issued. Therefore, the obviousness-type double patenting rejection cannot be withdrawn and a terminal disclaimer is required to overcome the rejection. Applicant's representative agreed, and indicated that a terminal disclaimer would be prepared and submitted..